

Edited and published from Liverpool by John Pinsent, MA DPhil., Dept of Greek, The University, PO Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX, who is the sole proprietor and to whom, addressed by name, subscriptions, and contributions on any subject of classical interest, should be sent, and to whom, also by name only, cheques made payable.

RATES, p.a. of 10 issues (not August and September)

Surface Mail: £4.00 UK and Europe, \$(US)10.00 anywhere else.

Air Mail: £5.50 Europe, \$(US)20 North America, \$(US)25 Australasia

The Editor is happy to accept cheques in Canadian dollars at the equivalent rate prevailing.

CONTENTS, the copyright of which remains in each case with the author, and is so secured at the end of each article.

O.Skutsch(London): Epigrammata Bobiensia 22	19
A.G.Lee(St John's College, Cambridge): <i>More on the syntax of Gallus</i>	19
H.B.Mattingly(Leeds): <i>Polybios' use of Fabius Pictor</i>	20
H.A.S.Tarrant(Sydney): <i>Two fragments of Cicero, Academica Book I</i>	21-22
J.C.Cressey(Birkbeck College, London): <i>The dogs of war: similes in Iliad 22</i>	22-24
M.Fantuzzi(Bologna): <i>συμπόσια at Tractatus Coislinianus 47</i>	24-25
Review: M.J.Alden	25-28
C.Doumas, ed., <i>Thera and the Aegean World. 1. Geosciences: papers presented at the Second International Scientific Congress, Santorini, August 1978. 2. Papers and proceedings of the Second International Scientific Congress, Santorini, Greece, August 1978.</i> London, Thera and the Aegean World, 1978 & 1980, pp.823 & 427, £32 each volume. Distributed by Aris & Phillips, Warminster	
F.R.D.Goodyear(Bedford College, London): <i>Afterthoughts on Corippus, Johannis</i>	28

Reactions to the new format of LCM, so far only, of course, from this country, so from only a small (but vociferous) minority of the 342 subscribers, has been predictably mixed, and the Editor will scream if he hears the magnifying glass joke again. He prefers the suggestion that each number should contain an Editorial Health Warning: Reading LCM may endanger your sight (though he might add that evidently many Doctors - if not the right kind - do it). Some have been favourable, and one correspondent even claims that it is more legible than the old. Others appreciate the motives, and subscribers at British Universities have happily accepted the new policy by which all copies for one place are sent in one envelope for internal distribution. The savings are considerable, £20 an issue in postage, £30 on a large issue like December, and though some claim that they would be willing to pay more for the old type, the Editor suspects that most are glad that LCM remains so cheap. For when the post goes up, as it will in March, the annual saving (that is, the amount by which the subscription would otherwise probably have to go up in 1983) must be about £1 per volume per year. Readers should also note that a reduction in number of pages is matched by an increase in the number of articles, and by the admission of footnotes (though he hopes that this will not become a regular requirement of contributors), and it is clear that he can once more offer very rapid publication of short notes, such as the two that appear on this page and the aptly named 'Afterthoughts' on the last one. It was a tactical error to have kept the old title page and notes: but the Editor is Themistoclean in his liking for what he always misquotes as *ἀπορροῦσθαι τὸ δίδυον* (? δίδυον II.2 intr. 'live', or more probably II.2.e 'continue' since LCM - and its Editor - certainly go on), and he may experiment next month with lesser degrees of reduction, if that proves possible. But probably not.

NOTE: The Editor imported a false reference to the ill-starred article by Professor Penella, LCM 6.9(Nov.1981), 245-6, making the Photius reference in the second line of p.245 60b when it should be 61a. He extends a further apology to Professor Penella and to readers who may have been misled. It will teach him to avoid officious extensions of references in future.

O.Skutsch(London): Epigrammata Bobiensia 22

LCM 7.2(Feb.1982), 19

uxorem duces si, Zoile, pauper egenam,
pauperie iunges, Zoile, pauperiem.
et si ualidam gaza dotisque superbam,
non illa uxor erit sed uiolens domina.

In line 3 *ualidam gaza* (*ualidum gazam* cod.) was restored by Munari, at suggested for et by Fuchs; but et may be right since the catalogue of evils continues in what follows. Attempts to mend the metre: *si <tu>* Cazzaniga, *si <idem>* E.Fraenkel, et *<bene>* Zicàri; all somewhat lame. *praeualidam* occurred to me as perhaps preferable, and when I checked the photograph in Speyer's edition I found it to be the reading of the manuscript.

Copyright (C) 1982 O.Skutsch.

A.G.Lee(St John's College, Cambridge): *More on the syntax of Gallus*

LCM 7.2(Feb.1982), 19

LCM 6.6(Jun.1981), 157, Roland Mayer expresses disbelief in the reading *tu ... pars erit* of the Gallus papyrus. The other day, by sheer chance, I came across an analogous case of the attraction of the verb to the person of the predicate at Augustine, *Confessions* 6.6.9 (I quote the context; there is no textual trouble, see Verheijen's edition in the *Corpus Christianorum*, 1981): *inhiabam honoribus, lucris, coniugio, et tu inridebas. patiebar in eis cupiditatibus amarissimas difficultates te propitio tanto magis, quanto minus sinebas mihi dulcescere quod non eras tu*. Fussy translates: '... the less Thou sufferedst aught to grow sweet to me which was not Thou'. That *tu* is here the predicate can best be seen by comparison with, say, Livy 30.30.12 *quod ego fui ad Trasumennum, ad Cannas, id tu hodie es*, where *tu* is clearly the subject. Admittedly Augustine is writing some four hundred years after Gallus, but he was trained as a rhetorician and the passage is undeniable evidence that the attraction in question does occur - in this form and in late Latin at least.

Copyright (C) 1982 A.G.Lee

It would be generally agreed, I imagine, that both Polybios and Livy used Fabius Pictor for their accounts of the battle of Trasimene and its aftermath. Several narrative features coincide and so on the whole do the figures for both armies' casualties and for the Roman prisoners, for which Livy expressly cites Fabius' authority. There is also the shared bias against C.Flaminius. (on all this see Walbank, *Commentary on Polybios* I, pp.414-420). It is likely then that the famous words ascribed to the praetor at Rome after the disaster come straight from Pictor. In Livy (22.7.8) we find the stark *pugna magna victi sumus*. Plutarch, drawing on Livy (he too names the praetor as M.Pomponius), translates this as *νενικήμεθα μεγάλην μάχην* (*Fab.Max.3.4*). Against that Polybios' *λεηλώμεθα μάχην μεγάλην* has, firstly, noun before adjective as in the Latin. He further prefers his characteristic *λεηλώσθαι* to *νικᾶσθαι* or even the common *ἡττῶσθαι*, and the vivid present to either perfect or aorist¹. Was Polybios also translating into his own idiom from a Latin source? I here run aground on the rock of scholarly consensus. All appear agreed that Fabius Pictor, a man of the Hannibalic generation, wrote in Greek. My challenge in *LCM* 1.1(Jan.1976), pp.3-7, has had no perceptible effect. So Polybios will have translated the praetor's phrase from Fabius' Greek into his own, and he repeats it exactly in 5.101.6. I wonder why he did not simply take over Fabius' wording. Its style could hardly have offended his Greek sensibility as deeply as A.Albinus affected to fear a full generation later (Polybios 39.1.1-12).

Another 'Fabian' section of Polybios demands attention. In his rapid narrative of Gallic affairs before the crisis of 225 B.C. he refers to certain Gauls as *Transalpini* and *Gaesatae* respectively (2.19.1 & 21.5; 22.1 etc.). The latter, he explains, were so called because they were mercenaries armed with the throwing spear or *gaesum* (see on this question Walbank I, p.194f.). Now Orosius seems to have preserved Fabius' own note on this name (4.13.5: H.Peter, *HRR* 1²[1914], pp.35ff., frg.23): *cum etiam ex ulteriore Gallia ingens adventare exercitus nuntiaretur, maxime Gaesatorum, quod nomen non gentis sed mercennarios Gallorum est*. Earlier Polybios clearly had Fabius' note in mind when he glossed *Transalpini* for his Greek readers in his general introduction on Gallic lands and the Gauls (2.15.8-9): ... Γαλάται Τρανσαλπίνοι προσαγορεύμενοι ... Τρανσαλπίνοί γε μὴν οὐ διὰ τὴν τοῦ γένους, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν τοῦ τόπου διαφορὰν προσαγορεύονται· τὸ γὰρ τῶν ἐξερμηνεύμενόν ἐστι πέραν, διὰ τοὺς ἐπέκεινα τῶν Ἀλπεων Τρανσαλπίνους καλοῦσι. Like Fabius he stresses that these Gauls are not named after any tribal affiliation. Instead the Romans define them geographically, since *trans* means 'beyond' and they are all located beyond the Alps. Polybios' use of Latin terms in his work is discreet and, except for technical terms, he rarely uses them when acceptable Greek alternatives exist (see on this J.-A.de Foucault, *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe* [1972], pp.57-62). This passage is virtually unique. It is easy to understand if he found himself faced repeatedly with *Transalpini* - naturally unglossed - in a Latin source. But if Fabius wrote in Greek, we should have to assume that he transliterated *Transalpini* and simply left it at that. Polybios would never have turned an acceptable Greek paraphrase of the Roman term back into the Latin original.

My 1976 thesis was that Polybios' Fabius did indeed write in Latin, and that the Greek annals of Pictor were a later translation by a descendant, with perhaps some additions and expansion. I suggested the man mentioned in Cicero's *Brutus* (81) as a contemporary of A.Albinus (cos. 151 B.C.), whose Greek history - thanks to Polybios - is notorious. The traditional text, as given by Malcovati (1965) and Douglas (1966) in their editions, runs as follows: *et tenuit cum hoc locum quemdam etiam Ser.Fulvius et una Ser.Fabius Pictor et iuris et litterarum et antiquitatis bene peritus*. His credentials appear impeccable, and he may well be the writer on pontifical law cited by Gellius, Nonius and others (H.Peter, *HRR* I, pp.CLXXIV-VI & 114-6). Badian, however, has cogently shown that the *praenomen* should be N. and not Ser. The guesses *una serius* or *una Ser.* must give way before Martha's inspired *Numerius*, which Malcovati took up in her second edition of 1970 (see *JRS* 57[1967], p.228; *LCM* 1.7[Jul.1976], p.97f.).

Badian curiously ignored in 1976 another more awkward Ciceronian passage. Admittedly he had previously ruled it out of court (*JRS* 57[1967], p.228): 'Cic., div. I, 43 is in any case irrelevant and should no longer be cited in this connection, since *nimirum* in should be read there'. The MSS reading in fact is ... *hisque adiungatur etiam Aeneae somnium, quod in numerum Fabi Pictoris Graecis annalibus eius modi est ut* ... There is no cogency either in Herz's in *nostrum Fabi Pictoris* or in Dederich's *nimirum* in, which Peter preferred (*HRR* I, p.LXXIX, n.1). I am tempted to return to Sigonius' in *Numeri*, but for an uneasy suspicion that Gutschmid may have been right in thinking that *IN* by dittography became *INN*; some scribe then would have read this as *IN N.* and a successor expanded *N.* as *Numerius*.

So perhaps Cicero, *de div.* 1.43 is irrelevant. Without its support my view may seem to founder on the evidence for the *praenomen* of the Fabius Pictor who wrote in Greek (see on this, besides Badian, N.Horsfall in *LCM* 1.2[Feb.1976], p.18). Dionysius gives it as 'Quintus', and in 1974 G. Manganaro published an inscription from a library at Tauromenium that apparently calls the same man 'A.Fabius C.f. Pictorinus the Roman'. In such a place, in the company of Greek historians such as Philistos and Kallisthenes, defined as 'the Roman', he hardly looks like a Latin annalist - while the ten-line summary of his Roman pre-history reads very like the Fabian material in Dionysius (see on this Manganaro, *Parola del Passato* 29, pp.389-409, and Horsfall, loc.cit.).

It is worth asking how - even on my thesis - the Greek annals would have been headed. A certain Claudius turned the Greek annals of C.Acilius into Latin (Livy 25.39.11 & 35.14.1), and presumably the title ran 'The annals of C.Acilius translated into Latin by ?Claudius' or the like. The heading of Pictor's Greek annals could equally well have run 'The annals of Q.Fabius C.f. Pictor translated by N.Fabius Pictor'. We need not assume that either of our Greek informants read or compared the Latin annals with the original Greek, so that the latter could have stood for them as the original Hannibalic Pictor's work. I would continue to identify him with the praetor of 189 B.C., who would have been born c. 230 B.C.. The new filiation fits easily with the 3rd-century stemma of the family (I agree here with Badian's observation in *LCM* 1976, p.98). The Greek annals would be the work of his son, father of the moneyer of c. 125 B.C. (Crawford, *RRC*, p.291f., no.268).

1. For these traits see A.Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexikon* I.4(1975), p.1474 (19 occurrences, 6 with *μάχη* etc.) & 1656-8 (only once?); I.3(1966), p.1128f. (58 occurrences, 6 with *μάχη* etc.).

To the untrained eye the fragments of Book I of the *Academica* are not of great interest, but both help us to understand the crucial debate between Philo of Larissa and Antiochus of Ascalon, the debate which provided most of the material of the *Academica*.

Fr.1 can alone be assigned with certainty to this book. The speaker appears to react with hostility to the idea that Mnesarchus and Antipater (that is to say the Stoa in general) were not, after all, so very far away from Carneades on an unspecified issue: *quid igitur stomachatur Mnesarchus? quid Antipater digladiatur cum Carneade tot voluminibus?* Presumably the issue was an epistemological one, and it is safe enough to presume that the idea which inspired these remarks is that of Philo of Larissa, who denied that the Academics had maintained in every sense¹ a body of doctrine usually associated with them (Ac.2.12). His denial is treated by 'Lucullus' as a lie (ibid., cf. 18). It was no doubt important for the theme of his so-called 'Roman Books', mentioned at Ac.1.13, which maintained that there was no major doctrinal rift between the Academy of Plato and that of Carneades. Though scholarly attention has mostly focussed upon his quasi-sceptical view of Plato (Ac.1.46), there is no doubt that his mild view of Carneades (cf. Ac.2.78) also played a part in his Unity-thesis.

Philo's 'lie' must have involved a seemingly gross distortion of Academic history, particularly because the Academics had very little which could be called established doctrine. Their position was clear on only a handful of issues: chiefly (a) that the senses lack accuracy and objectivity², and (b) that nothing was apprehensible (*κατάληπτόν*); the latter is the only Academic dogma³. Philo is known to have limited the scope of (b), applying it only to the Stoic notion of apprehension (Sextus Empiricus, Ph.1.235), and the Unity-thesis entails that he ascribed this position to the whole Academic tradition: Plato would not have tolerated Stoic apprehension, while Arcesilaus⁴ and Carneades⁵ attacked only the Stoic sense of the word. Philo's 'lie' was his harmless view of the Carneadean non-apprehensibility doctrine, such that it could be reconciled with Plato. Fr.1 of *Academica Posteriora* protests that if Carneades had really been so impotent the Stoics would not have responded with such acrimony.

It follows that Philo's Roman theory, incorporating the 'lie', was given some exposure in *Post.*, as could be expected from 1.13. The book is almost exclusively concerned with rival perceptions of the history of philosophy, and our text is cut short when Antiochus' view has been expounded (1.15-42) and the Philonian view is being introduced (44-46). Though this introduction may suggest a more orthodox view than that taken in the Roman books, it is the Roman thesis which is expounded, and Cicero can hardly have passed over Roman 'innovations' altogether⁶. We shall now see further evidence of the relevance of the Roman Books to *Academica Posteriora* I.

The text of fr.2 is uncertain at various points, not least where some early MSS of Nonius assign the extract to Book II. But other fragments of Book II (fr.3-11, excluding 5 and possibly 6) demonstrate that the book was chiefly concerned with the Academic attack on the objectivity of the senses. Fr.2 is concerned with the history of philosophy, and is thus entirely appropriate to Book I⁷. A provisional text might read: *qui cum similitudine verbi concinere maxime sibi videretur*. The Loeb text has *quicum*, and Plasberg prints *quae cum* and *veri* (Lindsay); the latter emendation is particularly rash, since other Ciceronian uses of *concinere* (*Fin.* 4.60 & 72, *ND* 1.16) concern the contrast between verbal and doctrinal similarity as well as taking *cum* as a preposition. Though I tend to favour *quicum* against the advice of J.S.Reid (who prints the text as above), one cannot be certain of it; nor is it essential to my case.

All texts with reasonable MSS authority give the impression that some recent thinker (x) believed that some earlier thinker (y) supported him, since y used a word (W1) similar to another word (W2) used and defended by x. This agrees with our knowledge of Book I as being a vehicle for rival claims by Antiochian and Philonian factions for the authority of the ancients. Since the 'sceptic' is most likely to be speaking and less likely to base strong claims on a single word, it is likely to be Antiochus who made such claims in his notorious efforts to reconcile a quasi-Stoic epistemology with Plato, Old Academy, and Lyceum. Reid's denial that the fragment had such a context, on the grounds that Antiochus' claims were based on doctrinal similarities rather than verbal ones⁸, is odd. Certainly Antiochus acknowledged that Stoic theory had often changed earlier terminology while preserving the essence of the doctrine⁹, but he would certainly have used similarities in terminology where it suited him. This is particularly true in matters of epistemology, since the *Academica* offer us little reason for seeing Stoic (and thus Antiochian) doctrine in either Plato or Aristotle: Zeno's innovations are acknowledged (Ac.1.40 & 43).

W2 was clearly an important term in the epistemology of x, indicating a concept which x needed to defend. If he was a dogmatist then it must be linked with the notion of certain apprehension (*κατάληψις*); if an anti-dogmatist, with non-apprehensibility (*ἀκατάληψία*). y must be an ancient authority whose support x sought, and W1 must be a term close to, but not identical with, W2, and found in y's writings. It need not be a technical term in those writings, but must feature prominently there, either because of its frequency or because it appears in a key context. Similarly W2 must not appear in the right sense in any key passage of y, otherwise direct appeal would

1. On the sense of *omnino* here see J.Gluckler, *Antiochus and the Late Academy* (Göttingen 1978: hereafter *Ant.*), p.80 n.227: cf. Aenesidemus attacking Philo in Photius, B.170a36 πάντως .. ἀκατάληπτον.
2. See the fr. of *Ac.Post.II* (for relativity particularly fr.9); also Ac.2.79ff.. Lack of accuracy was maintained even in the mild (Philonian?) version of the doctrine at Aetius 4.9.2 (Diels, *Dox.* 396b17-19).
3. Ac.2.29; Gellius, *NA* 115.8; Sextus Empiricus, *PH* 1.226. Ac.2.133 *quod mihi tecum est dogma commune* gives Cicero's personal view.
4. On the anti-Stoic motivation of Arcesilaus, Sextus Emp., *Math.* 7.150-8 and Ac.2.77 are in agreement.
5. Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 7.159ff. refuses to see Carneades as one who confines his attacks to the Stoic epistemology.
6. Gluckler, *Ant.* 84-88 gives good reason to suppose that Cicero played down the innovatory aspects of the Roman books, but he concludes from different considerations that these books are the source of Ac.1.44ff.; see *Ant.* p.419.
7. cf. 1.13 and all other remains of the book.
8. In his edition of the work (London 1885) ad loc.; Reid is led astray by the difference between Antiochus' pre-Sosus and Sosus positions.
9. Ac.2.15, *Fin.* 4.72, 5.22.

be made to W2 in *y* and W1 would play no part.

Thus we are searching for a technical term of the Stoics not used by (e.g.) Plato in an epistemological sense (or possibly a technical term of the Academics not so used). Of key terms (implying belief in apprehension or non-apprehensibility) only *κατάληψις*, *ἐνδογεία* and *ἀκατάληψία* suggest themselves strongly, and only the first has 'similar' terms to which an appeal could easily be made.

By chance we have an account of an attempt to show that Plato was a dogmatist which concludes by linking Platonic *περίληψις* (Tim.28a1, cl. 29a7, 52a7) with Stoic (?) *κατάληψις*. This account (Sextus Empiricus, *Math.*7.143-4) has long been thought to go back to Antiochus' *Canonica*, along with much else from 7.89-260¹⁰. If that is so, then the *Canonica* must unquestionably belong to Antiochus' earlier career, when he wrote fine epistemological works as an Academic, even though he gained a reputation for his pro-Stoic views (Ac.2.69)¹¹. *Math.*7.143 attributes to Plato the view that *ἐνδογεία* can be false, which would involve Plato in the distinction between *perspicua* and *percepta*; the distinction is treated with scorn by 'Lucullus' at Ac.2.34, and could not have been attributed to Plato by Antiochus after the Sosus-affair. Moreover *Math.*7.141ff. treats the 'New' Academics as the same school as the 'Old' and as a separate school from Peripatetics and Stoics, so that, if Antiochus had an influence on the structure, he was not yet proposing his mature view of the history of thought. Again, Antiochus, the acknowledged source, is treating Carneades sympathetically at 7.159-165, even though he is trying to draw some lessons for the dogmatist from Carneadean theory. The Old Stoa are not treated with such obvious sympathy as later in Antiochus' career (7.227-241), though there is undisguised support for later Stoic theory (7.253-260, especially 258f.).

Now if, before Philo wrote his Roman Books, Antiochus had been claiming a similarity between Platonic *περίληψις* and Stoic *κατάληψις*, the this does not merely explain Ac.Post. fr.2. It explains the theory of the Roman Books themselves. However one interprets Sextus Empiricus, PH 1.235, Philo acknowledged that things may in some way be apprehensible, though not in a sense which would conform with the Stoic definition of 'apprehension'. This retreat must have resulted from considerable pressures upon Philo, since it entailed the abandonment of a meaningful non-apprehensibility doctrine. Assuming that the retreat occurred in the Roman Books (which is virtually certain, for their innovation caused surprise, Ac.2.11), then it is likely to have been prompted by the need to claim Plato's authority. Either (A) Platonic doctrine was different from New Academic, or (B) Platonic *περίληψις* was not like *κατάληψις* in any sense, or (C) Platonic *περίληψις* was not like the sense of *κατάληψις* to which the New Academy objected and the New Academy did accept it in some sense. Philo chose (C); like Plato's Guardians he preferred the noble lie. He adequately refuted Antiochus' view of Platonic epistemology (as a result of which Antiochian views of Plato are more sober by Ac.1.30-31), but he was left with an untenable account of Carneades.

In what sense did Philo agree to things being apprehensible? Clearly in the 'Peripatetic' sense of Ac.2.112, which requires only a mental imprint conforming with a true object or fact. The Philonian Academy's *perspicua* were such that they believed in *aliquid perspicui, verum illud quidem et impressum in animo* (Ac.2.34). In *Fin.*5.76 Cicero denies that there is any significant difference between Academic and Peripatetic epistemology, other than that Academics have adopted the Stoic definition of apprehension, which leads them to deny that it is possible. At Ac.2.112 Cicero 'would not quarrel much' with the Peripatetic position, a significant concession from a school which traditionally argued against all positions.

Why is the 'Peripatetic' version of apprehension not prominent in extant parts of the *Academica*? Chiefly because both Stoics and Academics habitually employed the term in its Stoic sense, and because this was the only sense which would suffice for Antiochus' needs. The question which the *Academica* poses is whether apprehension is possible in the Stoic sense. After the historical surveys of Book I of the final version there is no further need to discuss obsolete senses of the term or related Platonic vocabulary. Similarly there is no further need to make use of Philo's Roman theory, which was designed to refute an out-dated Antiochian stance.

10. Since Hirzel, *Untersuchungen* III.493ff.

11. On this passage see Gucker, *Ant.* p.23 with n.49. I cannot agree that Antiochus had formally seceded from the Academy by the time of the Sosus-affair, for he would not then have been so surprised at Philo's attack on his views (Ac.2.11).

Copyright (C) 1982 H.A.S.Tarrant

J.C.Cressey (Birkbeck, London): *The dogs of war: similes in Iliad 22*

LCM 7.2(Feb.1982), 22-24

This article lists the similes in *Iliad* 22, indicates why they are effective individually and what is their total effect on the book.

- 1) *ὡς οἱ μὲν κατὰ ἄστυ πεφύσcentes ἤντε νεβροὶ* 1.
The brief comparison, apparently casual - if not quotidian -, sets the tone for the book's animalism (see further on 189).

- 2) *στυάμενος ὡς θ' ἔλπιος ἀεθλοφόρος σὺν ὀχεσφιν,*
ὡς ῥά τε δαῖτα θέρει τιτανόμενος πεδίοιο·
ὡς Ἀχιλλεύς λαίψηρόν πόδας καὶ γούνατ' ἐνάμα. 22-24
Achilles is compared to a horse - not the charioteer -, a prize-winning horse. ἀεθλοφόρος is proleptic, an adumbration of the book's resolution (for the prize motif see 157ff., 206f.; for the horse, 159ff.).

- 3) *παμφαίνονθ' ὡς τ' ἀστέρ' ἐπεσσομένον πεδίοιο,*
ὡς ῥά τ' ὀπάσης εἰσιν, δαίχληλοι δέ οἱ αὐγαὶ
φαίνονται πολλοῖσι μετ' ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῶ·
ὅν τε κύν' Ὠρίωνος ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσι.
λαμπρότατος μὲν δ' ὕ' ἐστί, κακὸν δέ τε σῆμα τέτυκται,
καὶ τε φέρεται πολλὸν πυρετὸν δειλοῖσι βοστοῖσιν· 26-31

We are told that the star is deleterious; it also rises late, and time is running out for Hector, for Troy, and for Achilles. Again Achilles is compared to an animal, a hound, i.e. fast, and even more pertinent for the situation, a hunter's dog: he is compared not to the hunter, but to his mastiff.

This should be linked with the standard threats and apprehensions of mutilation by dogs and lammergeyers after death: Priam 42 & 66ff., Hecabe 89, Achilles 335f., 348, 354, Hector 339, Andromache 509, and with Achilles' wish that he himself could rend and devour Hector's cadaver 346f.. Whether there is a direct link or not the book's stress on animalism is continued and strengthened by such statements.

- 4) ὥς δὲ δόρῳ ἐπὶ χειρὶ δόεστος ἄνδρα μένῃσι, ,
βεβρωκὼς κακὰ φάρμακ', ἔδω δὲ τέ μιν χόλος αἰνός,
σιμεδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν ἑλισσόμενος περὶ χειρὶ
ὥς ἔκτωρ ...

93-96

Here the animal is waiting for a man, here Hector is the animal; so at this point - briefly - the roles are reversed, the hunter is hunted (though the simile could suggest that the beast is trapped; note the repetition ἐπὶ χειρὶ ... περὶ χειρὶ).

οὐδὲ τί μ' αἰδέσεται, κενέει δὲ με γυμνὸν ἔοντα
αὖτως ὥς τε γυναῖκα, ἐπεὶ κ' ἀπὸ τεύχεα δύνω.
οὐ μὲν πως νῦν ἔστιν ἀπὸ δουρὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης
τῷ ὀαριζέμεναι, ἃ τε παρθένος ἡϊθέος τε,
παρθένος ἡϊθέος τ' ὀαρίζετον ἀλλήλοισιν.

124-128

This curious comparison may have been suggested by γυναῖκα in 125 and/or Achilles' sexual tastes (on this hardly perennial see M.I. Finley, *The world of Odysseus*, p.127f.; K.J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality*, pp.196ff.). For the dalliance of death motif see my article 'Life and death in Aeneid 6', LCM 3.8 (Oct.1978), 222-3. ὀαρίζε is also used at Iliad 6.516 - about Hector and Andromache -, and compare the sardonic tone of 17.227-8 (Hector speaking)

τῷ τις νῦν ἔθυσ τετραμμένος ἢ ἀπολέσθω
ἢ σαωθῆτω· ἢ γὰρ πολέμου ὀαριστὺς.

Lines 127-8 constitute a veritable tour-de-force: the singular τῷ at the start is balanced by the sexual juxtaposition of παρθένος ἡϊθέος τε in the same line, which is underscored by epianalepsis in the next, in which the words are balanced by a sexual pairing in ὀαρίζετον ἀλλήλοισιν, which rounds off the couplet and coupling. The singular becomes plural becomes dual: balance, positioning, integration, crescendo. Homer knew something of sex.

- 6) Ἴσος Ἐυαλίῳ, κορυθαίκε πτολεμιστῇ, 132
Achilles becomes war personified and so, presumably, invincible. It is curious that Vergil, in Aeneid 12.331ff., compares not Aeneas but Turnus to Mauors.

- 7) ἀμφὶ δὲ χαλκὸς ἐλάμπετο εἰκελὸς αὐγῇ
ἢ πυρὸς αἰθομένου ἢ ἡελίου ἀνιδόντος.

134-135

Again as at 26-31 and 317-8 Achilles is likened to a celestial body. The best comment on this simile is provided by Plutarch, *Pompey* 14.4 ὁ δὲ Πυμπήμιος οὐκ ὑπέπτηξεν, ἀλλ' ἐννοεῖν ἐκέλευσε τὸν Σύλλαν ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα πλείονες ἢ δυόμενον προσκυνοῦσιν, ὥς αὐτῷ μὲν αὐξομένης, μειομένης δὲ καὶ μαραινόμενης ἐκείνῳ τῆς δυνάμεως.

- 8) ἥτε κίρκος ὄρεσθαι, ἐλαφρότατος πετεηνῶν,
ὀηιδίως οἴμητε μετὰ τρήρῳα πέλειαν,
ἢ δὲ θ' ὀπαιθα φορεῖται, ὁ δ' ἐγγύθεν ὀξύ λεληκῶς
ταρφέ' ἐπαίσει, ἔλθειν τέ ἐ θυμὸς ἀνώνει·
ὥς ἄρ' ὁ γ' ἐμμεμῶς ἔθυσ πέτετο, τρέσε δ' ἔκτωρ

139-143

Once again stress on speed, on hunting: a neatly integrated simile where πετεηνῶν in the simile is picked up by πέτετο outwith it (on such 'bilateral correspondence' in similes see David West, 'Multiple-correspondence Similes in the Aeneid', JRS 59(1969), 40ff.).

- 9) κορυμνὸν δ' ἔκτανον καλλιρῶν· ἔνθα δὲ πηγαίαι
δοιαὶ ἀναίσσουσι Σκαμάνδρου ἡνιήεντος.
ἢ μὲν γὰρ θ' ὄδατι λιανῶ ῥέει, ἀμφὶ δὲ καπνὸς
γίνεται ἐξ αὐτῆς ὥς εἰ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο·
ἢ δ' ἑτέρῃ θόρεϊ προρέει εἰκυῖα χαλάζῃ
ἢ χιόνι ψυχρῇ, ἢ ἐξ ὄδατος κορυτάλλῳ.

147-152

No direct comparison here, but the two springs may well allude to the two warriors: πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο has been applied to Achilles at 135 (8 above) - is Hector equated with coldness and death? Cf. Sophocles, *Antigone* 88 θερμὴν ἐπὶ ψυχροῖσι καρδίαν ἔχεις, OC 622 (νέκυς) ψυχρὸς ποτ' αὐτῶν θερμὸν αἷμα πίεται, and compare Aeneid 12.521ff., a sophisticated simile in which both protagonists are likened to a) a forest fire and b) rivers in spate.

- 10) ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἱερῶν οὐδὲ βοείων
ἀρνύσθην, ἃ τε ποσσὶν ἀέθλια γίνεται ἄνδρῶν,
ἀλλὰ περὶ ψυχῆς θεὸν ἔκτορος ἱπποδάμοιο.
ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀεθλοφόροι περὶ τέροματ' αἰώνυχες ἱπποῖ
ρίμῳ μάλα τραχώσι· τὸ δὲ μέγα κέϊται ἀέθλου
ἢ τοῖπος ἢ γυνῆ, ἄνδρὸς κατατεθνηῶτος·
ὥς τῷ τοῖς Πριάμοιο πόλιν περὶ δινηθήτην

159-165

This glances back at 22ff. (2 above), where Achilles was the stallion ἀεθλοφόρος. Is ἱπποδάμοιο applied here to Hector inept? ironic? or sad - the last race, the final rodeo? The simile could look forward to the funeral games for Patroclus where tripods, oxen and women *inter alia* feature as prizes.

- 11) ὥς δ' ὅτε νεβρὸν ὄρεσθαι κύων ἐλάφοιο δίηται,
ὄρας ἐξ εὐνῆς, διὰ τ' ἄγκυα καὶ διὰ βήσας·
τὸν δ' εἰ πέο τε λάθῃσι καταπτήξας ὑπὸ θάμῳ,
ἀλλὰ τ' ἀνιχνεύων θέει ἔμπεδον, ὅρα κεν εὐρη·
ὥς ἔκτωρ οὐ λῆθε ποδῶκα Πηλεΐωνα.

189-193

Once again a canine simile which also picks up an earlier one, indeed line 1 (1 above) where the Trojans *en masse* are compared to νεβροί. At 456 in a curious echo Andromache uses the verb δίηται

δεῖδω μὴ δὴ μοι θρασὺν ἔκτορα δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς
μοῦνον ἀποπτήξας πόλιος πεδίωνδε δίηται

455-456

- 12) ὥς δ' ἐν ὄνειρῳ οὐ δύναται φεύγοντα διώκειν·
οὐτ' ἄρ' ὁ τὸν δύναται ὑποφύγειν οὐθ' ὁ διώκειν·
ὥς ὁ τὸν οὐ δύνατο μάρνασθαι ποσὶν, οὐδ' ὅς ἀλύξει. 199-201
The dream simile involving both protagonists. The use of ὄνειρος suggests death, compare
Odyssey 11.207-8 τρίς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιῇ ἐκκελον ἦ καὶ ὄνειρῳ
ἐπατ'.

and 221-2

- ἐπεὶ κε πρῶτα λίπη λεύκ' ὅστέα θυμός,
ψυχὴ δ' ἔστ' ὄνειρος ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται.
13) At lines 262ff. Achilles employs animal parallels in his rejection of Hector's terms
ὥς οὐκ ἔστι λέουσι καὶ ἀνδράσιν ὄρκια πιστά,
οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ὁμόφρονα θυμῶν ἔχουσιν,
ἀλλὰ κακὰ φρονέουσι διαμπερὲς ἀλλήλοισιν,
ὥς οὐκ ἔστ' ἐμὲ καὶ σὲ φιλήμεναι, 262-265
With this clichéd hatred compare the fine visionary δόγματα of Isaiah, 11.6 'The wolf also shall
dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion
and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them'. Cf. Horace, C.3.18.13.
14) οἴμηνεν δὲ ἀλείς ὥς τ' αἰετὸς ὑψηπέτης,
ὥς τ' εἴσιν πεδίονδε διὰ νεφέων ἑρεβενῶν
ἀρπάξων ἦ ἄρν' ἀμαλῆν ἦ πτῶκα λαγῶν·
ὥς ἔκτωρ οἴμηνε 308-311

Hector is a bird stooping on its prey; as in the simile at 93ff. (4 above) the roles are re-
versed and Hector is the swift hunter. The brief reversal is required for dramatic effect, to
maintain interest (compare the two prize-winning horses at 159ff. [10 above]) - perhaps the may-
hem is not ineluctable, maybe he can escape.

- 15) οἷος δ' ἀστὴρ εἴσι μετ' ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῶ
ἔσπερος, ὃς κάλλιπτος ἐν οὐρανῷ ἴσταται ἀστὴρ,
ὃς αἰχμῆς ἀπέλαμπ' εὐήκεος, 317-319

As in 26ff. (3 above) Achilles (or strictly his spear) is likened to a star and, as in that
comparison, there is lateness, ἔσπερος.

The remaining 196 lines of the book are bereft of similes apart from the succinct μαινάδι
ἵση (of Andromache at 460), though in the build up of images that we have seen Achilles' μή με,
κύον, at 345 should be mentioned. The images, then, are concentrated during the hunting sequence.

In Book 22 Achilles and Hector are regularly compared to animals, and this is allied with
much peripheral use of animal references: they are also, as elsewhere, compared to deities (Hector
226 & 393 [ἔκτορα δῖον, 434-5 τοῖ σέ θεὸν ὥς | δεῖδέχατ'·]; Achilles 279 [θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεύ]).
No need to make a connexion, perhaps, even if Apollo is σμινθεύς and Athene γλαυκῶπις, or the
gods invented hunting τὸ μὲν εἶδημα θεῶν, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Ἀρτέμιδος, ἄγραι καὶ κύνες· ἔδοσαν δὲ
καὶ ἐτίμησαν τοῦτ' αἰχμῶνα διὰ δικαιοσύνην (Xenophon, *Cynageticus* 1.1). Cheiron, he continues,
passed it on to, among others, Achilles. No need, perhaps, to make the connexion, or see Book
22 as a bleak vision - 'l'homme est, je vous l'avoue, un méchant animal', and the gods no better
'As flies to wanton boys, are we to the gods - | they kill us for their sport' - but worth a
thought.

Whether the similes are later additions to the Homeric narrative I leave aside (on this see
G.P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer*², Cambridge (Classical Studies) 1972, 208-222). What
is surely patent from the above analysis is that in Book 22 the similes are integrated into the
narrative matrix, often cross-reference each other, and have a central sustained motif of venery:
they are not a gallimaufry of random images.

Copyright (C) 1982 J.C. Cressey

M. Fantuzzi (Bologna): συμφωνία at Tractatus Coislinianus 47

LCM 7.2 (Feb. 1982), 24-25

La considerazione dei sei elementi costitutivi (μῦθος, ᾠή, διάνοια, λέξις, μέλος, ὄψις)
della commedia, quale si attua in *tractatus Coislinianus* 36-50 Koster, notoriamente riprende lo
schema esapartito proposto da Aristotele, *Poet.* 1450a7-b20, per la tragedia: con frequenti banal-
izzazioni, vistose lacune, insidiose se non inspiegabili aggiunte.

In particolare, sembrerebbe non trovare alcun riscontro nello Stagiritico la problematica de-
finizione che il *Coislinianus* offre per la ὄψις: ἡ ὄψις μεγάλην χρῆσιν τοῖς δράμασι τὴν συμφω-
νίαν παρέχει. Nella sua traduzione del trattato stesso - l'unica autorevole in una lingua moder-
na - Lane Cooper propone una esegesi difficilmente comprensibile: 'spectacle is of great ad-
vantage to dramas in supplying what is in concord with them'². Quali siano gli elementi 'in con-
cord' con i δράματα, lo sottintenderebbe un'ellissi, che pare troppo oscura anche per lo stilo
compendioso del trattatello. È ancora più difficilmente comprensibile che l'ultimo, versatissimo
editore, W.J.W. Koster - integrando διὰ davanti a τὴν συμφωνίαν - non solo accolga tale esegesi,
ma addirittura la richiami in apparato: per chiarire (o sostenere?) il suo intervento³.

Il testo tradito aveva già inquietato altri editori: τῇ ψυχαγωγίᾳ ο ἑς τὴν ψυχαγωγίαν aveva
suggerito il Bernays⁴, εἰς τὴν ψυχαγωγίαν era dubitativa⁵ proposta del Bergk. Si tratta di emen-
damenti che, nel loro immotivato ricondurre il *Coislinianus* ad una coincidenza puntuale con Ari-
stotele, *Poet.* 1450b16s. ἡ δὲ ὄψις ψυχαγωγικὸν μὲν κτλ., dal dettato del trattatello - si converrà
con il Koster⁶ - longius distant.

- È un elemento drammaturgico, che non viene considerato in nessun altro dei cosiddetti *Prolego-
mena* περί κωμωδίας. Del termine ricorre bensì spesso il plurale, nell'originaria, e più comune
accezione di 'volti': cf. XIB 14; XVII 6; XVIII 15; XVIIIb2 13; 3 12 Koster.
- An *Aristotelian Theory of Comedy*, New York 1922, 226.
- Prolegomena de comoedia*, Groningen 1975, 67.
- Si veda 'Ergänzung zu Aristoteles' *Poetik*', *RhMus* 8 (1853), 576s..
- Il carattere dubitativo della proposta era sottolineato da 'fortasse'; cf. *Aristophanis Comoed-
i iae*, I², Lipsiae 1867, IX.
- Ibid.

Della validità della forma tradita συμφωνία, nonché di una sua finora ignorata esegesi, paiono garantire Hesychio, σ 2807 Schm. συστάσεις· σύνοδοι. συμφωνίαι, e Polluce, VI 158 (II 41,21 Bethe) σύστασις, συμμετρία, συμφωνία. Termine *passee-partout* del greco tardo antico e bizantino⁷, συμφωνία andrà qui inteso come banalizzante sinonimo del glossematico σύστασις⁸. Avvalorano questa interpretazione le stesse considerazioni aristoteliche sulla ὄψις⁹: cf. *Poet.* 1453b1-6 ἔστιν μὲν οὖν τὸ φοβερόν καὶ τὸ ἐλεεινὸν ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως γίνεσθαι, ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἡ σύ- τῆς τῆς συστάσεως τῶν πραγμάτων ὅπερ ἐστὶ πρότερον καὶ ποιητοῦ ἀμείνωνος. δεῖ γὰρ καὶ ἀνευ τοῦ ὁρᾶν ὁρᾶν συνεστάναι τὸν μῦθον, ὥστε τὸν ἀκούοντα τὰ πράγματα γινόμενα καὶ φρίττειν καὶ ἐλε- εῖν ἐκ τῶν συμβαινόντων (...). τὸ δὲ διὰ τῆς ὄψεως τοῦτο παρασκευάζειν ἀτεχνότερον καὶ χορη- γίας δεδομένον ἐστίν.¹⁰

Nella sua polemica contro le degenerazioni spettacolari nel teatro del IV secolo, condotta dalle posizioni di retroguardia di un teatro d'autore - di un teatro della parola, che privile- giasse il testo scritto -, Aristotele non poteva non rilevare (e biasimare) la superfetazione della funzionalità della ὄψις: un elemento tecnico-scenico, non precipuamente 'poetico', perché non specificamente d'autore. Era infatti tramite il proliferante 'elemento spettacolare', che il fattore τερατώδης¹¹ improntava a sé i coevi δράματα: in competizione, nel determinare l'effetto catartico, con il συνεστάναι (la *consistentia*¹²) di una fabula (μῦθος) e/o di un sujet (τὰ πράγ- ματα) sempre più inconsistenti¹³.

7. Per la proliferazione dei significati, che il termine subisce in età bizantina, cf. Dimitra- kos, *ML* VIII 6847. In Aristotele la despecificizzazione al di fuori del campo semantico musi- cale è ancora percepita nella sua natura metaforica, né è quindi catacresticamente 'canoniz- zata': cf. *Top.* 123a33-37 σκοπεῖν δὲ καὶ εἰ τὸ μεταφορᾷ λεγόμενον ὡς γένος ἀποδέδωκεν, οἷον τὴν σαρκοσύνην συμφωνίαν· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ γένος κυρίως κατὰ τῶν εἰδῶν κατηγορεῖται, ἡ δὲ συμφωνία κατὰ τῆς σαρκοσύνης οὐ κυρίως ἀλλὰ μεταφορᾷ· πᾶσα γὰρ συμφωνία ἐν φθόγοις.
8. Termine che ricorre bensì negli stessi *Prolegomena*, ma sempre e solo in due espressioni fisse, che appaiono residuali estrapolazioni, puntualmente ripetitive, da più antiche fonti: ὁ δὲ ἑλὼς τῆς καμωδίας ἐκ τε λέξεων καὶ πραγμάτων ἔχει τὴν σύστασιν (cf. *XIb* 67 VI 1 Koster; para- frasata nello stesso *Coislinianus* 38 μῦθος καμικός ἐστίν ὁ περὶ γελοίας πράξεις ἔχων τὴν σύ- στασιν), nonché σύστασις τὲ τούτων (scil. τῶν σκηνικῶν) ὑπῆρχε τὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν πρόσωπα (*XIa* II 88 = *XIc* 92).
9. Sul rifiuto della ὄψις nella concezione aristotelica del teatro, cf. B.Marzullo.
10. Cf. anche infra, n.12.
11. Espressamente condannata da Aristotele, *Poet.* 1453b9-13. L'opportunità di un moderato θαυμα- στὸν sarà tuttavia asserita in 1460a12.
12. Così traduceva il termine σύστασις l'umanista Guillelmus de Moerbeka.
13. Definendo e partitamente trattando i sei elementi componenti la tragedia, lo Stagirita (*Poet.* 1450a13-17) aveva rilevato la primaria efficacia di una 'inclusiva' di tutti gli altri fattori, salvo poi proclamare la primazia, che la σύστασις τῶν πραγμάτων avrebbe dovuto le- gittimamente ricoprire: καὶ γὰρ ὄψις ἔχει πᾶν (la sequenza è stata ritenuta corrotta, ma del sue significato - e della sua significatività - pare non potersi dubitare) καὶ ἥθος καὶ μῦ- θον καὶ λέξιν καὶ μέλος καὶ διδάσκοντα ὡσαύτως. μέγιστον δὲ τούτων ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων συ- στασις.

Copyright (C) 1982 M.Fantuzzi.

Review: M.J.Alden (The Queen's University, Belfast)

LCM 7.2(Feb.1982), 25-28

C.Doumas, ed., *Thera and the Aegean World*. 1. *Geosciences: papers presented at the Second Inter- national Scientific Congress, Santorini, August 1978*. 2. *Papers and proceedings of the Second International Scientific Congress, Santorini, Greece, August 1978*. London, Thera and the Aegean World, 1978 & 1980, pp.823 & 427, £32 each volume. Distributed by Aris & Phillips, Warminster.

When asked to review volume 1 of these papers, I thought it would be sensible to wait until the promised second volume appeared. When in due course it arrived, though it was by no means as large as the first, I was so daunted by the combined bulk of both volumes that there was further delay while I attempted to summon up the courage to deal with the task. What follows is not the result of new-found courage, but rather of mounting guilt.

Reviewing every piece of a Festschrift is one of those absurd feats, like swimming under water the length of the baths, which count only as pointless bravado' (John Vincent, reviewing Hugh Lloyd-Jones, ed., *History and Imagination: Essays in Honour of H.R.Trevor-Roper*, Duckworth 1981, in *The Observer*). Perhaps the same could be said of reviewing the proceedings of a confer- ence, with the added embarrassment of being, in some sense, in the position of one reviewing the conference itself, without having attended it. As a rule, congress proceedings all relate to the same subject, so that the reviewer, however inexperienced, has at least some hope of understanding something of all the contributions. Though the title of these volumes suggests that the Thera congress might have been one of these, they in fact include a number of highly technical papers on vulcanology, geophysics, botany etc., which could only properly be reviewed by experts in the relevant fields. Even a lay reader is able to perceive that differences arise between traditional archaeologists and scientists as to e.g. the effect and depth of the tephra falls on Crete¹, the

1. D.L.Page, 'On the Relation between the Thera Eruption and the Desolation of Eastern Crete c. 1450 B.C.', vol.1 pp.691-698, says (p.693) that, as a result of the ashfall, Crete must have been abandoned 'for a decade or two', whereas H.Pichler & W.L.Friedrich, 'Mechanism of the Minoan Eruption of Santorini', vol.2, pp.15-30, think that the ashfall on Crete is likely to have been only 0.5mm., and that such a fall is unlikely to have been disastrous. For further contradiction, C.Renfrew, discussion session 11, vol.2, p.396, thinks that the possibility remains that it was the Santorini eruption which caused the destruction of Crete.

possible destruction caused by tsunamis², the time-lag between earthquake and volcanic eruption³ and indeed whether the earthquake which caused the abandonment of Thera was connected with the volcanic eruption⁴. The pity of it is that the lay reader is unlikely to be able to exercise critical judgement on every field covered by the congress. Those looking for an *ὁπὸν δόξα* will not need to bother themselves with these two handsome, and rather lavishly produced volumes, which, like the congress, are a forum for discussion, and which demonstrate, as was remarked by Jörg Keller (in his closing remarks in discussion session 11, vol.2 p.404) the possibilities of co-operation between archaeologists and geoscientists.

The introduction in volume 1 gives an account of the history of interest in the island of Thera, beginning with the account of the somewhat mythological characters ('*τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀποῦς ἐμπατίων παίδων παῖδες*', Herodotus 4.145.2) who, driven out from Lemnos, sailed to Sparta, and in unusual circumstances joined the expedition led by Therans to Thera. The introduction also explains that the purpose of the congress is not so much to concentrate on the scientific problems of Thera *per se*, but to try to look at them in relation to the people who lived there. It certainly appears to have made this attempt, as may be seen merely from examining the list of titles of the papers offered. Professor Iakovides remarks in the second concluding address (vol. 2 p.409) that the scope of the conference is somewhat large, but that is no bad thing, and one feels that a congress on such a scale, and which appears to have covered the subject from all angles, was essential in order to disabuse the public of certain misapprehensions⁵, and to make it aware of the dangers of attempting to use a natural catastrophe like the eruption of a volcano as an easy explanation for the destructions of LMIB in Crete and elsewhere⁶.

The opening addresses by G.E.Mylonas and P.Nomikos are published at the beginning of volume 2. The editor's note at the beginning of that volume explains that it contains papers which arrived too late for inclusion in vol.1, though they were in fact discussed at the congress⁷. Volume 2 also contains the discussion of all the papers, which, for obvious reasons of logistics, does not appear, as it might more conveniently have done, at the end of each paper. The congress appears to have been held in sections, some of which, I infer, ran concurrently, as seems to be the practice at large congresses. The papers are grouped in these sections, e.g. Geosciences, vol.1 pp.21-150, Geophysics and Vulcanicity, vol.1 pp.153-228. All are given in English, and each is preceded by an abstract. Certain authors of papers seem to have changed their minds between the submission of papers for publication in volume 1 and the discussions held at the conference itself⁸. This could be misleading for the faint-hearted, who may not reach the end, and one should check, at least in the discussion in volume 2 of the papers in question, whether the author still thought in volume 2 what he appeared to think in volume 1.

The weight of these volumes will ensure that such activities are confined to libraries. Lavish and beautiful colour plates, most notably of the frescoes, appear in volume 1, though there are a few colour photographs of stratigraphy in volume 2⁹. Black-and-white photographs and line diagrams appear throughout. As well as papers and discussion volume 2 contains a handsomely produced geological map and profiles of the Santorini islands by H.Pichler and S.Kussmaul, with a commentary on them by H.Pichler (vol.2, pp.412-427). The presentation of the map and profiles in a looseleaf envelope may make it advisable for librarians and other persons who have lost their faith in human nature to find some way of securing them.

In view of my many disclaimers, contributors to the congress who do not find their contribution to the congress mentioned here should attribute the omission rather to the deficiencies of the reviewer than to any in the contribution. Limitations of space will in any event preclude comment on every section.

Sections I and II, *Orogenesis, plate tectonics and early vulcanicity of the Aegean*, vol.1 pp.21-150, and *Geophysics and Vulcanicity*, vol.1 pp.153-228, carefully explain the nature of the

2. I.Yokoyama, 'The Tsunami Caused by the Prehistoric Eruption of Thera', vol.1, pp.277-283 and discussion session 8, vol.2 pp.360-362 and p.365 in the same discussion.
3. D.L.Page, 'On the Relation between the Thera Eruption and the Desolation of Eastern Crete c. 1450 B.C.', vol.1 pp.691-698 at p.697, uses the layer of humus between the upper surface of the earthquake debris and the first deposit of pumice to clinch his argument for a time-lag of one generation between the earthquake and the eruption. C.Blott, 'Volcanism and Seismicity in Mediterranean Island Arcs', vol.1, pp.33-44, points out on p.43 that since Thera had been partially destroyed and reconstructed before the Minoan eruption, a certain time must have elapsed between the earthquake and the eruption, and calculates the interval at $2 \text{ years} \pm \frac{1}{2}$.
4. See P.Hédervári, discussion session 8, vol.2 pp.366-7, and G.Komlós, P.Hédervári & S.Mészáros, 'A Brief Note on Tectonic Earthquakes Related to the Activity of Santorini from Antiquity to the Present', vol.1 pp.97-107 at p.104: 'from 1858.01.01 to 1878.01.01, there had been practically a seismic circle around Santorini with a radius of $r \leq 130\text{km}$ during the eruptive period of 1866-1870, the number of smaller shallow shocks showed a remarkable growth relative to the period preceding and following the eruptive cycle'.
5. e.g. that the tsunami could be a wall of roaring white water capable of wreaking great destruction: P.Hédervári, discussion session 8, vol.2 p.365, points out that it could not have been.
6. M.S.F.Hood, discussion session 9A, vol.2 p.372.
7. Volume 1 was completed about a year before the congress, which was held in August 1978. It was unfortunately necessary to postpone the congress for a year from its intended date, due to the tragic last illness and death of the organizer's son, Mr M.Nomikos. In the circumstances, it was very good of Mr Nomikos to go ahead with the congress.
8. e.g. P.Hédervári, discussion session 8, vol.2 p.363, makes some alterations to his article 'Geonomic Notes on the Bronze Age Eruption of Santorini', vol.1 pp.153-161, in the light of information given him by Chr.Doumas: the marks on the Libyan fresco are not the result of a *nuée ardente*. Similarly, fig.2 on p.260 of vol.1, which appears in S.Mészáros, 'The Minoan Tsunami of Santorini', vol.1 pp.257-261, should be superseded by Hédervári's new diagram on p.364 of vol.2. L.Wilson, 'Energetics of the Minoan Eruption: Some Revisions', vol.2, pp.31-35, contains certain alterations to his paper 'Energetics of the Minoan Eruption', pp.221-228 in in the 1978 volume.
9. See H.Pichler and W.L.Friedrich, 'The Minoan Eruption of Santorini', vol.2 pp.15-30

Aegean regions in terms of seismic activity, rock types etc., and discuss sea-level changes as a result of earthquakes etc.. The behaviour of the Santorini volcano is compared with that of more recently erupting volcanoes, notably Krakatoa.

Section III, *Destructive Effects of the Bronze Age Eruption*, vol.1 pp.231-283, is really devoted to a question which played a great part in the final discussions: could the eruption of the Santorini volcano have been responsible for the abandonment of Cretan palaces and settlement sites in LMIB? G.Cadogan and R.K.Harrison, 'Evidence of Tephra in Soil Samples from Pyrgos, Crete', vol.1, pp.235-255 esp. p.251, are of the opinion that no volcano can be so selective as to decide to destroy the settlement at Knossos but not the Palace, and the country house at Pyrgos but not the settlement. They think these destructions likely to be the work of humans, and this is most poignantly picked up by Sinclair Hood, as reported by the chairman of discussion session 9A, Professor J.N.Coldstream, vol.2 pp.372-3: he 'commented on the reluctance among archaeologists today to accept wars and invasions as explanations for archaeological phenomena. He reminded them, however, of what they and their fathers and grandfathers had achieved in the way of slaughter and destruction in two world wars, and ventured to suspect that all the natural cataclysms, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions and tsunamis that had occurred since the dawn of historic times had not achieved such destruction and slaughter as this'. Mr Hood is most elegantly supported by Mrs Hankey, with a quotation from Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Everyman edition 1938, 3.1-2): 'In his description of the violent earthquake which shook the coasts of Sicily, Dalmatia, Greece and Egypt in the second year of the reign of Valentinian and Valens [A.D. 365] he remarks "man has much more to fear from the passions of his fellow creatures than from the convulsions of the elements"'. P.Åström, 'Traces of the Eruption of Thera in Cyprus?', vol.1 pp.231-234, thinks that the eruption of Thera may have had something to do with destructions in the north-west part of Cyprus in Late Cypriote I, though it seems that the effects of the volcanic eruption will have been less catastrophic on the island of Crete: S.Thorinsson, 'Some Comments on the Minoan Eruption of Santorini', vol.1 pp.263-275 esp. pp.270-271. Thorinsson is more than supported by R.J.Blong, 'The possible Effects of the Santorini Tephra Fall on Minoan Crete', vol.2 pp.217-226, who gives a detailed account of the effects of tephra on animals and humans, agriculture and buildings in recorded eruptions, and concludes that the effect on Crete of the tephra fall, while by no means agreeable, cannot have been disastrous.

The section which discusses the first aspect of *Archaeology: Akrotiri and the Aegean*, vol.1 pp.367-456, is perhaps most notable for the diametrically opposed views of Renfrew and Schachermeyr. A.C.Renfrew, 'Phylakopi and the Late Bronze I Period in the Cyclades', vol.1 pp.403-421, suggests that there is likely to be a palatial building and archive on Thera, which would enlighten us on its status in relation to Crete. F.Schachermeyr, 'Akrotiri - First Maritime Republic', vol.1 pp.423-428, thinks no palace has been found because none existed, and that the settlement at Akrotiri is a cosmopolitan community of merchants and patricians. J.M.Wagstaff, 'The Reconstruction of Settlement Patterns on Thera in Relation to the Cyclades', vol.1 pp.449-456, laments on p.450 the absence of representative samples for his demographic studies, though does this in a manner which appears to show some animosity towards the traditional archaeologist. One can only hope that the information he requires will eventually become available.

The second section on *Archaeology: Ceramics and Technology*, vol.1 pp.459-514, is, as might be inferred, largely dedicated to analysis of clay types by various means. The paper by R.E.Jones, 'Composition and Provenience Studies of Cycladic Pottery, with Particular Reference to Thera', vol.1 pp.471-482, is especially noteworthy, despite his discovery that his type of clay analysis will not distinguish Thera pottery from Melian, for its clarity to the non-scientific reader, and its refusal to write gobbledy-gook. Thera potters, according to W.Noll, 'Material and Techniques of the Minoan Ceramics of Thera and Crete', vol.1 pp.493-505, seem to have taken some techniques from Crete, but to have developed also techniques of their own (as it seems is also true in the case of Thera houses: J.W.Shaw, 'Consideration of Akrotiri as a Minoan Settlement', vol.1 pp.429-436). The article by P.M.Warren in the third section on *Archaeology: Akrotiri: Artifacts*, vol.1 pp.517-568, 'The Unfinished Red Marble Jar at Akrotiri, Thera', vol.1 pp.554-568, would make very helpful reading for students who are not sure how these things are made. Professor Warren finds himself in the interesting situation of having to use French and German words for tool which lack a name in English.

The fourth section on *Archaeology: Wall-Painting: Iconography and Techniques*, vol.1 pp.571-664, contains a number of papers which are clearly in disagreement as to the actual technique of the frescoes (are they true frescoes, painted on wet plaster, or is some form of adhesive used in the paint? See discussion session 6, vol.2 pp.311-312), as well as the inevitable discussion of exactly what may be going on in the Ship Procession in the Miniature Fresco (L.Morgan-Brown, 'The Ship Procession in the Miniature Fresco', vol.1 pp.629-644, and O.Negbi, 'The Miniature Fresco and Mycenae', vol.1 pp.645-646). A.Sakellariou, 'The West House Miniature Frescoes', vol.2 pp.147-153, goes so far as to compare the Thera Ship Fresco with the *Isidos navigium* as described in Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* XI. The identification involves not one assumption but three: firstly, that the ship fresco represents a religious occasion; secondly, that there may have been some Egyptian influence on religious beliefs in the Bronze Age Aegean; and thirdly, that the 2nd century A.D. account in Apuleius describes a festival of not inconsiderable antiquity. A.Patrianakou-Iliaki, 'The Excavation of Wall-Paintings at the Site of Akrotiri', vol.1 pp.657-660, reminds us of the difficulty of excavating fragments of fresco which have fallen from their walls, and the importance of recording the exact findspots of the fragments, which will have followed a certain basic direction in their fall from the wall.

The final section on *Archaeology: The Consequences of the Late Bronze Age Destruction*, vol.1 pp.665-701, contains two very interesting papers, one by Furumark and one by Page. A.Furumark, 'The Thera-Catastrophe - Consequences for European Civilization', pp.665-674, gives an excellent and useful summary of destructions related to seismic activity on p.668. He also attempts to communicate the 'feel' his very detailed study of pottery has given him for the differences between Mycenaean and Minoan culture. D.L.Page, 'The Thera Eruption and the Desolation of East Crete', vol.1 pp.691-698, produced a characteristic knock-down argument, using an earthquake in Thera one generation before the eruption of the volcano to account for the lack of marine-style pottery on Thera. He was (as always) at first sight convincing: W.Schiering, 'The Eruption of the Volcano

on Thera and the Destructions on Crete', vol.1 pp.699-701, is in strong disagreement with him.

In Part III, *Related Sciences*, Section I: *Biosciences*, H.van Effenterre, 'Time for Vulcanologists, Time for Archaeologists', vol.1 pp.783-4, asks the very pertinent question, whether vulcanologists and archaeologists can really work together on the eruption of Thera. Perhaps Professor Keller, in his concluding remarks, vol.2 p.404, answers him: 'I am especially pleased to be able to state after this meeting that the heavy demand from either side - archaeology and geosciences - for clear answers and measured information from the other, did not lead us to stretch the evidence'. Chr.Doumas, 'The stratigraphy of Akrotiri', vol.1 pp.777-782, is a helpful article which should be compulsory reading for all students of the subject: it includes the tantalizing information that the earliest stratigraphic evidence of the eruption is a thin layer of pumice, yellowish from oxidation, which suggests that it had been exposed to the atmosphere for some time before it was covered by the next pumice fall. Was this the warning signal which caused the population to evacuate?

Anyone concerned with radio-carbon dating, and that should surely by now include all students of archaeology, will find the article by G.A.Weinstein and P.P.Betancourt, 'Interpreting the Thera Radio-Carbon Dates', vol.1 pp.805-814, essential reading. However, the paper of L.Pomerance, 'Improbability of a Thera Collapse During the New Kingdom 1503-1447 B.C.', vol.1 pp.797-803, begs certain questions, and if he wants to associate the force of the Thera eruption with destructions c.1200 he will surely have to account for the absence of at least LMII, LMIIIA and LMIIIB on Thera.

The first paper in the second volume, H.Fichler and W.L.Friedrich, 'Mechanism of the Minoan Eruption of Santorini', vol.2 pp.15-30, contains a carefully detailed account of what appears to have happened in the course of the eruption, convincingly illustrated with good clear photographs. There are a number of interesting papers which discuss plants and vegetation on Thera at the time of the eruption, including a very attractive paper by Iris Douskos, 'The Crocuses of Santorini', vol.2 pp.141-146, in which she argues for the possibility that dye from Thera crocuses may have been an export commodity.

The paper by N.H.Gale, 'Some aspects of Lead and Silver Mining in the Aegean', vol.2 pp.161-195, should be read by those interested in the sources of metal ores in the Aegean, and by those interested in the Cape Gelidonya shipwreck. Recipients of Dr Gale's offprints have been lucky, since his article is a very comprehensive account. Unfortunately I am not competent to judge it critically. The 'Comments prior to the Akrotiri Visit' by Chr.Doumas, vol.2, pp.253-256, will be very helpful for anyone who has not the advantage of having visited the site, since they are made by one with long experience of excavation at Thera. It is a shame that the article as published could not be illustrated, as the lecture itself must have been.

I shall refrain from attempting to review the discussion, which, as I have already explained, appears after the papers: one can refer, however, if one has both volumes, to the relevant section of discussion for comments on the paper with which one is concerned. The practice of keeping all the discussion to the end of a congress can make it lack spontaneity, though not, apparently, at the Thera congress, and can make the prospect of contributing to it all the more daunting. I say this in appeal to organizers of conferences, and would quote in my support Professor Iakovides: 'We have all remarked that the only really fruitful sessions in this Congress were the sessions where there was some time left for discussion. [Presumably, therefore, discussion before a final session or two set aside for 'Discussion'] Discussion, after all, is the whole point of any Congress' (concluding address, vol.2 p.409).

The publication is a lavish one, as, by all reports, was the Congress itself. This is due in large part to the energy and generosity of Mr Nomikos, whose interest in his πατριδα does him credit, and not least for his indication, in his concluding address (vol.2 p.404) of the destruction of Thera by quarrying for pumice, and the danger to both archaeological remains and the beauty of the landscape, if such work is allowed to continue unhindered.

The publication is handsome, and the price is as high as the quality suggests. There is a case for quality publications, with clear diagrams and photographs, but the cost may well put the Congress proceedings beyond the reach of many private individuals. Callimachus would not have approved of this book: I do.

Copyright (C) 1982 M.J.Alden

F.R.D.Goodyear (Bedford College, London): *Afterthoughts on Corippus*, Iohannis

LCM 7.2(Feb.1982), 28

There are three tentative corrections, unrecorded in the edition by Diggle and Goodyear (Cambridge 1970), which I now think at least worth mention:

2.106-8

nam fortis Ilaguas

quondam per latos prostratus vulnere campos

†iuncta seua dedit, praedis bellisque pepercit.

uincula saeua adiit (cf.1.19-20 and 7.506-7) would make sense in the immediate context. But, in view of the serious corruption in 105, the whole context is hard to appraise.

2.113

Ifurac infestis venit consultus in armis.

inconsultus may seem more appropriate, for the notion of rashness is much in mind hereabouts: cf. 104 *nullas timet ille ruinas*, 123 *solito ... furor*, 125 *furor*. Further, *venit* as a present would accord with 37 *conuenit*, 118 *mittit*, and 121 *conueniunt*, also perhaps 116 *descendit*.

6.206-7

uiribus inde suis bellorum ductor farene

se tutum fortemque putans ...

et arte might fit very well: cf. 4.601-3 *arte ... multo callidus astu ... tutus* (if this conjecture is right) and in particular 8.15-19

non uiribus audet

Carcasan nostris fretus concurrere telis,

arte sed asper agit, Latias uexare cohortes

et fugere inde parans. fugiat licet improbus astu,

non tamen effugiet: tanta superabitur arte.

Copyright (C) 1982 F.R.D.Goodyear